

Remarks

Reconsideration and reversal of the rejections expressed in the Office Action of March 9, 2007 are respectfully contended in view of the following remarks and the application as amended. A method for controlling the dummy dispense of liquid is disclosed. The method includes the steps of: recording a time at which a substrate is processed; recording a time at which a liquid is dispensed; comparing the time at which the substrate is processed and the time at which the liquid is dispensed to determine whether a dummy dispense is required; and generating a dummy dispense signal when the dummy dispense is required.

Claims 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph. The claims have been clarified to overcome these rejections. Note that claim 12 had been cancelled in the previous Amendment and Response, thus rendering that rejection moot.

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of Yoshizawa et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,442,561. The Office Action states, inter alia, that it would have been obvious to include recording a recipe for dispensing the liquid and the name of the liquid because Yoshizawa et al. teaches conditions utilized in the manufacturing environment as important. Applicants presume that the Examiner meant the rejection to apply to claims 1 and 4-11, as noted on the Office Action Summary page.

The '561 patent relates to a production management system for controlling the production of various industrial products such as semiconductor components, e.g., LSI, clothes, and automobiles. Applicant respectfully contends that there is no teaching or suggestion in the reference of a method for generating a dummy dispense signal, comprising the steps as presently claimed. For instance, upon a fair reading of the '561 patent, there is no suggestion of recording a recipe for dispensing the volatile solution and a name of the volatile solution, as disclosed and claimed in the new claim set presently submitted. Furthermore, there is no reasonable expectation that the combination of prior art and Yoshizawa et al. would be effective for the purposes of the present invention. Thus, *prima facie* obviousness is not established.

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully contended that the solicited claims define patentable subject matter. Reconsideration and reversal of the rejections expressed in the Office Action of March 9, 2007 are respectfully submitted. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if any questions arise during the course of reconsideration of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/7/07

Richard A. Paikoff

Richard A. Paikoff
Reg. No. 34,892
Duane Morris LLP
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4196
tel. 215-979-1853

DM2\1135143.1